

REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 31, 2001 with claims 1-48. Claims 1, 15 and 32 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,005,536 (hereinafter “Beadles”).

In this response, Applicants respectfully amend independent claims 1, 15 and 32 by incorporating dependent claim 30, which is now canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments above and remarks below.

Amended claim 1 incorporates additional clarifying language including language from dependent claim 30 in the step “wherein the portable processing device further comprises an input controller operatively coupled to the processor for allowing the user to enter one or more instructions to the processing device, and further wherein at least one of the one or more instructions comprises a channel selection instruction.”

In characterizing the Beadles reference as allegedly meeting certain limitations of claim 30, the Examiner relies primarily on column 3, lines 57-59. However, the relied-upon portions of Beadles fail to anticipate the limitations as alleged.

The Beadles reference, in column 3, lines 57-59, states the following, with emphasis supplied:

A recess path 407 provides a means for adjusting and focusing the displayed words by moving a knob 408, as shown in more detail in FIG. 5.

The relied upon portion of Beadles teaches against utilizing the input controller as a means “for allowing the user to enter one or more instructions to the processing device . . . wherein at least one of the one or more instructions comprises a channel selection instruction,” i.e., allowing the user “to choose a channel” (see the present specification at p. 10, lines 23-25 and FIG. 1). Instead, the Beadles reference associates a recess path 407 and knob 408 with adjusting and focusing the displayed words (Beadles, col. 3, lines 57-59). Thus, it appears that said recess path and knob arrangement is nothing more than a mechanical focus mechanism.

Attorney Docket No. YOR920000739US1

Accordingly, it is believed that the teachings of Beadles fail to meet the limitations of amended claim 1.

Independent claims 15 and 32 include limitations similar to those of claim 1, and are therefore believed allowable for reasons similar to those described above with reference to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-14, 16-31, 33-46 and 48 are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified with regard to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-48 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lewis  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 39,274  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-2946

Date: June 13, 2006